DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 907 EC 182 904

AUTHOR Jamieson, Janet D.; Johnson, Steven B.
TITLE The Use of Microcomputers for Special Education Program Management in California. A Report.
INSTITUTION Special Education Resource Network, Sacramento, CA. Resource Service Center.
PUB DATE 1 Apr 84
NOTE 83p.; Funded under Part D of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Presentation at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children was based on the document (64th, New Orleans, LA, March 31-April 4, 1986). For related documents, see EC 182 905-906.
AVAILABLE FROM Special Education Resource Network/Resource Service Center, 650 University Ave #201, Sacramento, CA 95825 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Management Information Systems; *Microcomputers; *Program Administration; School Districts; Special Education
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

Questionnaires were developed to identify California education agencies currently using microcomputers in special education program management and completed by 334 Special Education Local Planning Area directors, County Offices of Education, and districts. Data revealed that regardless of district size or organization type, a majority performed each of the administrative tasks by hand. Smaller districts reported the lowest levels of computer use and county offices generally the highest. Within each group the tasks having the highest level of computerization were those related to fiscal and personnel matters. Telephone interviews with 96 respondents supported questionnaire data suggesting very low current usage of microcomputers for special education program administration. Interviews also indicated that technical support staff are more frequently involved than administrators and that training to help administrators with consumer decisionmaking and software implementation was generally not available. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED270907

A REPORT ON:

THE USE OF MICROCOMPUTERS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IN CALIFORNIA

April 1, 1984

Janet D. Jamieson
Project Coordinator
Resource Service Center
Special Education Resource Network

Steven B. Johnson
Complex Director
Resource Service Center
Special Education Resource Network

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Steven B Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC182904

Presentation at the Annual Convention

of the

Council for Exceptional Children

was based on the document

64th, New Orleans, LA, March 31-April 4, 1986

This report was developed as part of a three year project entitled "Leadership Training for Administrators of Special Education in Emerging Technology." This project is funded under Part D of the Education of the Handicapped Act (20 U.S.C. 1431, 1434), and is administrated by the Resource Service Center of the Special Education Resource Network.

We would like to extend our appreciation to all those special education program administrators who took the time to complete and return the questionnaire and respond to our follow-up phone calls. Without their input this report would not have been possible.

If you have any questions or suggestions about the report or the project please feel free to contact the Project Coordinator at the Resource Service Center of SERN.

CONTENTS

List of Tables	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
DATA COLLECTION TASK	2
METHODOLOGY	2
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	3 - 10
Sample Selection	
Data Collection	
Data Analysis	
Results of the Survey Questionnaire	
Summary of the Questionnaire Data	
TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS	11 - 20
Sample Selection, data collection	
Data Analysis	
Results of the Interim data	
Software Matrix by Application	
Summary of the Interview Data	
RESOURCE INFORMATION BY APPLICATION	21 - 49
APPENDICES	50 - 72

TABLES

1 Respondents to Questionnaires
2 Method Application for districts less than 5,000 ADA
3 Method by application for districts between 5,000 and 10,000 ADA
4 Method by application for districts 10,000 ADA and greater
5 Method by application for SELPAs
6 Method by application for County Offices
7 Overall % by method, by organization structure by district size
8 Location by application for districts less than 5,000 ADA
9 Location by application for districts between 5,000 and 10,000 ADA
10 Location by application for districts of 10,000 ADA and greater
11 Location by application for SELPA's
12 Total no. of agencies interviewed by type
13 No. of administrators by type of training
14 No. of staff by type of training

INTRODUCTION

This data report represents the completion of the first major project task: to describe the current use of microcomputers for special education program administration in California. The information produced by this data collection task will be used to develop inservice training modules, a statewide system of regional user support groups, and to identify software currently being used for specific applications. The information collected on the questionnaires and through the telephone interviews has also been used to identify a list of resource persons, those individuals who indicated they were currently using microcomputers for special education program administration and who were willing to share information with others. This contact list is included as part of this report. All the information collected will be used to support other first year project tasks, and to give direction to activities in the second year of the project. For an overview of the total project see Appendix A.

DATA COLLECTION TASK

The first major task in year 1 of the project "Leadership Training for Administrators of Special Education in Emerging Technology" was to conduct a data collection effort to identify special education program administrator's inservice training needs; their current and projected use of emerging microcomputer technology; the availability of computer hardware and software; and needed software by application.

The Project Advisory Panel assisted in the development of the questionnaire and interview guide as well as the design of the data collection process.

METHODOLOGY

The method of approach used for the data collection for this study included a nested design in which a survey questionnaire was developed to identify education agencies who were currently using microcomputers for at least one application of special education program management, and structured interview guide was then used to collect additional information on software by application from those agencies which indicated on the questionnaire that they were using the microcomputers for at least one application and were willing to be contacted for a follow-up phone call.

In addition to collecting information on the use of computers, the questionnaire also asked respondents to identify individuals (including themselves if applicable) who they considered to be "experts" in the use and implementation of microcomputers for special education program management. These identified individuals will be contacted next fall to participate as potential members of the Regional User Groups which will be developed as a Year 2 activity of this project. They will also have an opportunity to apply to become part of the SERN Statewide Consultant Bank System, a statewide system which compiles and disseminates information on individuals who are interested in becoming consultants to education agencies throughout the state.

When we spoke to individuals in our follow-up telephone interviews we asked permission to include them as contacts for additional information in our data report. Only those who agreed to share what they were currently doing are included in the contact information which is part of this report.

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Sample Selection

Questionnaires were sent to all Special Education Local Planning Area (SELPA) directors, County Offices of Education (that were not SELPAs), and districts. We hypothesized that the organizational structure, geographical location, and size of the educational unit would influence their use of microcomputers for special education program management. Therefore, in addition to the SELPAs, and County Offices, we sampled districts within each county in California by average daily attendance (ADA) to include at least one district with less than 5,000 ADA, one with 5,000 to 10,000 ADA and one over 10,000 ADA if available. We also included districts who had an identified Director of Special Education. For the most part these districts were over 10,000 regular ADA.

Data Collection

We sent out approximately 500 survey questionnaires the second week in December of 1983, and asked that they be returned to us by January 7, 1984. We collected questionnaires through the first week in February 1984 and used those returned questionnaires in the data analysis for this report. Additional questionnaires continued to come in as late as the middle of March 1984; however, those that were returned after the February cut off date were not included in the data analyses for this report.

Accompanying each questionnaire was a cover letter and an abstract of the project (see Appendix B). We promised each respondent who completed and returned the questionnaire a copy of this data report.

A total of 334 questionnaires, representing, a response rate of 67%, were returned by the February 1984 deadline and the analysis was conducted on this set of data. The returns can be broken down into the following categories:

Table 1
Type of Unit by No. of Questionnaires Returned

Districts with less than 5,000* ADA	98
Districts with 5,000 to 10,000 ADA	63
Districts with more than 10,000 ADA	87
SELPAs (including districts and county offices that were SELPAs	83
County Offices (that were not SELPAs)	3
TOTAL	334

*Regular education Average Daily Attendance

The above categories were used to analyze the data, with the exception that the analysis for county offices included county offices that were also SELPAs, for a total of 44.

Data Analysis

A descriptive analysis was conducted using a microcomputer and dbase II software. On the questionnaire special education program administration applications included five major categories: pupil records, staffing, fiscal, reports, and miscellaneous. Each major application area included several specific applications related to the major group. For each special education program administration application respondents were asked to indicate how they currently were doing the task: by hand, by microcomputer, or by mainframe; and, where the task was being done: in their office, in the district office, or in the county office.

The data was then analyzed by type and size of the organizational structure: by SELPAs, County Offices, and districts under 5,000 ADA to 5,000 to 10,000 ADA; and over 10,000 ADA.

Results of the Survey Questionnaire

Currently used methods for administrative functions

The first analysis examined currently used methods for accomplishing each of the applications in the category of organizations described above. For each category, the average response within each of the five major administrative functions is reported here. For more complete details, see Table 1 through Table 5 in Appendix C.

For districts with less than 5000 ADA we found the following pattern of methods used.

Table 2
Method by Application for Districts less than 5,000 ADA

	By Hand	By Micro	By Mainframe
Pupil Records	82	10	6
Staffing	77	9	13
Fiscal	61	9	28
Reports	75	14	12
Miscellaneous	82	7	8

Note: All numbers are %'s. Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding.

The most heavily computerized applications for districts under 5,000 ADA was: Budget maintenance; Class/Service lists; and, Entitlement reports.

For districts with ADA's between 5,000 and 10,000 we found the following pattern of methods used to accomplish the administrative tasks:

Table 3
Method by Application for Districts between 5,000 ADA and 10,000 ADA

	By Hand	By Micro	By Mainframe
Pupil Records	76	11	11
Staffing	69	14	16
Fiscal	55	6	37
Reports	72	10	17
Miscellaneous	75	10	14

Note: All numbers are %'s. Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding.

The most heavily computerized applications for districts of this size was: Budget Maintenance; Entitlement Reports: and, Class/Service lists.

For the largest districts, those with ADA greater than 10,000, we found the following pattern of methods used:

Table 4
Method by Application for Districts between 10,000 ADA and greater

	By Hand	By Micro	By Mainframe
Pupil Records	68	15	14
Staffing	55	16	28
Fiscal	50	15	34
Reports	67	9	17
Miscellaneous	66	16	16

Note: All numbers are %'s. Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding

The most heavily computerized applications for districts in this size range were: Budget Maintenance; Class/Service lists; and Personnel Schedules.

The SELPAs indicated they used the following methods for their administrative functions.

Table 5
By Method by Application for SELPA's

	By Hand	By Micro	By Mainframe
Pupil Records	66	17	16
Staffing	54	23	22
Fiscal	50	18	30
Reports	63	20	16
Miscellaneous	62	14	23

Note: All numbers are %'s. Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding.

The most heavily computerized applications for the SELPAs were: Budget Maintenance; Class/Service Lists; and IEP Maintenance.

The last grouping we looked at was the county offices. This analysis was based on the responses of all county offices, irrespective of whether they were also SELPAs.

Table 6
Method by Application for County Offices

	By Hand	By Micro	By Mainframe
Pupil Records	66	21	11
Staffing	55	28	15
Fiscal	45	24	30
Reports	62	27	9
Miscellaneous	64	16	18

Note: All numbers are %'s. Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding.

The most heavily computerized applications in the county offices were: Budget Maintenance; Class/Service; and IEP Maintenance.

In summary, it was clear that whatever size or administrative level we looked at, the most common method for performing these administrative functions was by hand. Only in the general areas of fiscal and personnel administration did we see wide spread use of computers, and only in the SELPAs (most county offices are also SELPAs) did we see a major use for computers outside these areas, that of IEP maintenance.

In an attempt to identify who was currently using microcomputers for special education program management we computed an average percent by method for each organizational structure and district by size.

Table 7
Overall % by Method, by Organizational Structure by district size

	% By Hand	% By Micro	% By Mainframe
Districts under 5,000 ADA	75.4%	9.8%	13.4%
Districts 5,000 to 10,000 ADA	69.4%	10.2%	19.0%
Districts 10,000 ADA and over	61.2%	14.2%	28.8%
SELPAs	59.0%	18.4%	21.4%
County Offices of Education	54.4%	23.2%	16.6%

Note: Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding off

Although the data is confounded to some degree since SELPAs were counted twice [once as SELPAs, and once as County Offices (SELPAs were folded into the County Office data)], it appears that county offices and SELPAs do the least by hand, and as districts grow in terms of ADA they do less and less by hand. In terms of microcomputers, it appears that SELPAs, County offices of Education and districts over 10,000 use them the most. The mainframe data was not so clear because we were looking at how it was currently done and many districts used the county office or SELPA mainframe to do many of the special education program management applications identified in our survey. Overall, it appears that in California 64% of all special education program administration tasks which are amenable to computerization is still being done by hand. When computers are used, which is approximately 35% of the time, mainframes are more likely to be used (20% of the time) than microcomputers (15% of the time).

Location of computers used for administrative functions

A second analysis of the data examined where each application was most likely to be done: in the administrators office, the county office, or the district office. We were interested in determining where microcomputers for special education management were actually being used.

Given that the personal computer is just that, a device meant to be housed and used in the immediate vicinity of the decision maker, we looked at where computers were housed for those respondents who use microcomputers. We again used the breakdown by district size and organizational structure. Again, more complete information can be found in Appendix D, Table 6 through Table 10.

For the districts with less than 5000 ADA, the location of computers was as follows:

Table 8
By Location by Application for districts less than 5,000 ADA

	Your Office	District Office	County Office
Pupil Records	68	23	15
Staffing	33	31	33
Fiscal	14	50	35
Reports	40	24	35
Miscellaneous	54	30	16

Note: All numbers are %'s. Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding.

The applications most likely to be done on a microcomputer in the special education office in these smaller districts were: Student Profiles; Internal Memos; and Discrepancy score analysis.

The next group of districts analyzed were those with ADA's between 5,000 and 10,000. The locations of computers for these districts is as follows:

Table 9
By Location by Application for districts between 5,000 and 10,000 ADA

	Your Office	District Office	County Office
Pupil Records	56	34	6
Staffing	47	49	4
Fiscal	26	50	24
Reports	38	45	0
Miscellaneous	55	33	11

Note: All numbers are %'s. Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding.

The applications most likely to be done with ADA's of 10,000 and more, the following locations for computers were reported.

Table 10
By Location by Application for districts of 10,000 ADA and greater

	Your Office	District Office	County Office
Pupil Records	57	43	0
Staffing	47	46	8
Fiscal	43	50	6
Reports	54	35	7
Miscellaneous	39	60	0

Note: All numbers are %'s. Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding.

The applications most likely to be done on a microcomputer in the special education office were: IEP Maintenance; Parent Letters; and Internal Memos.

Computers were reported in the following locations for the SELPA's.

Table 11
By Location by Application for SELPAs

	Your Office	District Office	County Office
Pupil Records	32	50	17
Staffing	41	38	20
Fiscal	38	32	28
Reports	57	24	22
Miscellaneous	33	44	21

Note: All numbers are %'s. Row totals may not be 100% due to rounding.

The administrative functions reported most likely to be done on a microcomputer in the special education office of a SELPA were: State and Federal Reports; Internal Memos; Entitlement Reports; and, Inservice Management.

Summary of the Questionnaire Data

The most outstanding finding of the survey was that, irrespective of the size of the district or type of organization, a majority of respondents reported that they performed each of the administrative tasks by hand. The smaller districts (ADA less than 5,000) reported the lowest levels of computer use, with county offices generally reporting the highest level of use.

Within each group the tasks having the highest level of computerization were those related to fiscal and personnel matters.

For those districts using microcomputers, irrespective of size, the computer was more likely than not to be in the special education office for tasks related to pupil records and reports; and elsewhere in the district or county office for fiscal and personnel tasks.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

A structured telephone interview guide was developed to collect additional information from those respondents who indicated on the questionnaire that they were currently using a microcomputer for at least one special education program administration application and were willing to participate in a telephone interview. In the interview we asked for information on their hardware, training they or their staff had reviewed, future needs for training, a description of how they were currently using their computer, future applications and a description of their software and some evaluative information on how well it was working for them. We also asked if they currently participated in a users group of some type and if they would be interested in participating in a regional users support group focused around special education program administration if one was to be started. We also asked each interviewee who indicated they were using a microcomputer with some degree of success, if we could include contact information on them as part of this report. Only those who agreed to share what they were doing with others are included in the Resource Information section of this data report. For a copy of the structured interview guide see Appendix E.

Sample Selection for Telephone Interviews

Returned surveys were first sorted by those who indicated we could call them. Of those that said "yes" a second sort was made by those that indicated they were using microcomputers for at least one application. Respondents were then sorted by type of organizational structure (SELPA's, county offices and districts). Districts were sorted by size. The following is a description of the sample of interviewees by type and size of organization.

SELPA's

- Non district/non county SELPA's = 6
- County SELPA's = 11
- District SELPA's = 9

	Districts	Counties	Other
No.	9	11	6

County Offices

- SELPA's = 11
- Non SELPA's = 3

	SELPA's	Non SELPA's
No.	11	3

Districts

- Under 5,000 ADA = 22
- 5,000 to 10,000 ADA = 24
- 10,000 to 15,000 ADA = 13
- Over 15,000 (Non SELPA) = 8
- Over 15,000 (SELPA's) = 9

Under 5,000	5,000 to 10,000	10,000 to 15,000	Over 15,000 Non SELPA	Over 15,000 SELPA
22	24	13	8	9

Table 12
Total No. of Agencies Interviewed by type

Total No. of SELPA's	= 26
Total No. of County Offices (non SELPA's)	= 3
Total No. of Districts (non SELPA's)	= 67
Total No. of Phone Call Respondents	= 96

The total number of interviews selected was 96. However, we found that often the special education administrator was not the person who actually used the computer, especially in the larger districts, county offices and SELPAs. Therefore, we often conducted several interviews within one agency. On several occasions we found that even though the questionnaire respondent indicated they were using a microcomputer for special education program management, in fact they were not. These interviews were excluded in the final data analysis.

Data Analysis for Telephone Interviews

We conducted a content analysis of the data collected in the telephone interviews. (Appendix E) For the purpose of this report the data set was not analyzed by type or size of agency. An application matrix by commonly used software was developed to identify what software administrators were currently using for special education program administration. Finally, a contact list was developed by major applications which included evaluative as well as descriptive information.

Results of the Interview Data

We asked special education program administrators "how many micro computers do you currently have available for special education program management?" Only a few indicated they had more than one microcomputer available. True microcomputer networks were rare, and in several cases interviewees considered school or program terminals connected to a mainframe as a microcomputer network. In several instances we found districts using Apples that had been given to schools under the "Kids Can't Wait" Apple giveaway program for program administration. This was usually where they had had a reduction in ADA and closed a school.

We asked each person interviewed "have you had any training in using microcomputers and if so what?," and "has your staff received any training and if so what?" A total of 60 individuals responded to these questions. Of those who were speaking for themselves (primarily program administrators), the majority had received no formal training and were self taught. It appears that for the most part that those currently using microcomputers for program management are individuals who have a personal interest in computers and the initiative to teach themselves how to use it.

Table 13
A Description of Computer Training
received by Program Administrators

No. of Admin.	Training
36	Self Taught received no formal training
5	Received some training by personnel within the educational agency
7	Received some training at an institution of Higher Education
4	Received training from a commercial vendor (e.g., IBM, Radio Shack, Apple, etc.)
3	Received training from an outside consultant
3	Received training from a TECC
2	Attended a Professional Development workshop outside the education agency

It appeared that program administrators may be self taught for the most part; however, the staff that worked for these administrators received most of their training from "in-house" training provided by the administrators themselves or others within the district or county office.

Table 14
A Description of Computer Training
Received by Support Staff

No.	Training
28	Provided "in house" by program administrators or others within the educational agency
9	Received training from commercial vendors
8	Self-Taught
4	Had not received any training
5	Through the Institutions of higher education
3	From outside consultants
1	Through a staff development program outside the district
2	Through the TECC

We then asked each interviewee what training they would like to have for themselves or their staff in the future. Many indicated that they did not need any training right now or they did not know what training they might need. The training areas identified as areas of need included:

1. Awareness

   Many interviewees indicated that their staff still needed basic information about the use of microcomputers

2. Specific Software

   Many administrators indicated that they had inservice needs for implementing the use of specific software they had purchased or were contemplating purchasing. These included such software packages as: dBASE II, Lotus 1, 2, 3; Wordstar, Visicalc, as well as others.

3. Word Processing

Many administrators indicated that their staff needed training in word processing

4. Data Base Management Systems

This was an area identified for both staff and program administrators

5. Other areas of training needs identified included:

training on logic

programming

Other ways (applications) they could use their computer

how to write software

how to better use what they already have

what software is available

spreadsheet systems

networking

administrative application for classroom management

In addition to asking each interviewee to describe what they were currently doing with their microcomputer in relation to special education administration, we asked each respondent "are there other applications you are planning to implement or would like to implement in the future?" The following is a list of applications in terms of the number of times identified by respondents who answered this question.

No. of times Identified	Future Uses of Microcomputers
22	IEP development, generation, and maintenance
10	Budget (accounting, fiscal management, and projections)
6	Maintaining Student Records
5	Developing Psych Reports
4	Test Scoring and Assessment
3	Discrepancy Score Analysis (eligibility criteria)
3	Word Processing, Report Writing
3	Data Base Management
2	Inventory Control
2	Pupil Personnel Services
1	Library Control
1	Cafeteria Inventory
1	Tracking Referrals
1	Health Alerts
1	Class Lists
1	Attendance
1	Transportation

Application of Commonly Used Software

We attempted to identify the major microcomputer software currently being used for Special Education Program Management by application. The following is a matrix of this analysis:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Applications Matrix of
Commonly Used Software

Software / Application	dB Master	Ed. Res. Consultants	Woodcock Johnson	Ability Achelvement Discrepancies	Applevriter	Multiplan	PFS File & Report	Profile III	Superscript Set	Visicalc	Visiffle	Wordstar
IEP Maintenance	5	1	0	1	0	0	5	3	0	0	1	0
Student Profiles	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Discrepancy Score Analysis	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel Scheduling	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
Class Service Lists	6	1	0	0	2	0	6	3	0	0	2	0
Inservice Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fiscal Planning/ Projections	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Budget Maintenance	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	7	0	0
Entitlement Reports	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0
Internal Reports	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	4
State and Federal Reports	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Parent Letters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	5
Inventory Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation Scheduling	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Summary of the Interview Data

The interview data supported the findings from the survey questionnaire in that the current level of use of microcomputers for special education program administration appears to be very low. The interviews revealed that those who are involved in using microcomputers are for the most part: self taught, more apt to be a home hobbyist; are administrators in units with less than 1,000 special education ADA, are using the computer for data management rather than to support decision making; and, have been involved with using microcomputers for less than 5 years. It appeared that in the larger educational units, administrators may be responsible for program management but it is the technical support staff that are actually involved in the use of the microcomputers. For the units that currently use mini-computers and mainframe computers for their reports and data management, the major future need appears to center around establishing compatible microcomputer systems to interface with their current system. For many of the smaller county offices and districts a microcomputer may be all they need for their level of data management.

The data also revealed that very few training resources exist for administrators to support critical consumer decision making and implementing the software.

It is difficult to say at this point if there are unmet need areas for software because the level of use is so low. Several administrators indicated they were interested in software that could be used for fiscal forecasting. However, for the most part we found few administrators systematically planning for their future data needs, most were using specific application software packages that met their immediate needs. Almost all of those who were interviewed indicated a low level of sharing of information between education agencies and a need to do so. Therefore, the final section of this report contains resource information for networking information about the use of microcomputers for special education program management throughout California. This final section of the report is organized by major administrative applications. Within each application area there is information regarding those who are currently using microcomputers, the type of hardware and software used, and some evaluative information as to how well it is working for them. If you are just considering using microcomputers for special education program administration or are looking for application to implement in the future this resource information should be very valuable. All those included in this section have indicated that they are willing to be contacted to share additional information regarding their use of the microcomputer.

Resource Information

Application: Class/Service Lists

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
County Office			
Ardis Loonie Director, Spec. Services San Benito County Office of Ed. (408) 637-5393 ADA 243	Apple II	dB Master	great
District Offices			
Barbara Hahn Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Alvord Unified SD (714) 351-9367	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	works fine
John Sugiyama Director of Sp. Services Amador Valley/Pleasanton SD (415) 464-5500	TRS-80	Profile III+	works well
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	dBase II	adequate for use so far
Richard Simpson Director of Spec. Ed. Conejo Valley Unified (805) 497-9511	Apple IIe, hard disk	dB Master	easy to use
Vera Jashni Asst. Supt. Ed. Services Culver City Unified (213) 839-4361	Apple II+	PFS File & Report	excellent, but limited in the number of files it can store
Lynn Preston Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Cupertino Union Elementary (408) 252-3000	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	works very well

Brian Dixon Superintendent Hope Elementary (805) 682-2564	Apple II+	Visifile	great
Jack Taylor Director, Spec. Ed. Murray Elementary (415) 828-2554	TRS-80	Profile III+	easy to learn, works well
Dennis Kelleher Director, Pupil Personnel Novato Unified (415) 897-4201	Apple III	Applewriter	new, confusing, are still learning
Melody Huelsebusch Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Oceanside City Unified (619) 757-2560	Apple II+	dB Master	excellent report generator, takes less programming skill than dBase II
Chris Prator Psychologist Orland Joint Union Elementary (916) 865-3283	TRS-80 Model 3	Profile III	too many capabilities, fairly complex to learn
Betty Dodds Director, Instruction Oxnard Union High (805) 486-4777	CPT Word Processor	CPT	
Thayer Douglass Director, Sp. Services Placer Union High (916) 885-4581	Apple IIe	Applewriter	are changing to PFS, blundered into Applewriter by mistake
Dave Emal Diagnostic Lab Teacher Pomona Unified (714) 623-5251	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	easy to follow, good documentation

Joe Annicharico, Jr Asst. Supt. Ramona Unified SD (619) 789-2124	Apple II+	dB Master	very well
Illane Klein Director of Sp. Ed. Savanna School District (714) 527-5181	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	terrific
Susan Rookyard Coordinator, Spec. Ed. South Bay Union Elem. (619) 423-4555	Micom Word Processor	Micom	fine
Tris Hubbard Asst. Supt.,Inst. Support Sweetwater Union High (619) 691-5590	TRS-80 Model 3	written in office	works well
Robert S. Laney Supervisor, Spec. Ed. Vista Unified (619) 726-2170	ATC	ETS/dBase II	less powerful than software on mainframe
John C. Davis Acting Dir. Pupil Pers. Woodland Joint Unified (916) 662-0201	Apple III	Quickfile	
Carole Stone Psychologist Yorba Linda Elementary (714) 528-6088	Apple IIe	written for office	didn't work, couldn't get to keep track of student flow
SELPAs			
Peter Gonos Director Contra Costa SELPA (415) 827-0949 ADA 6000	Altos	Ed. Res. Consultants	just implementing

Eugene Fahlbusch Adminstrator SELPA Desert/Mountain SELPA (619) 243-1240 ADA 2450	IBM Displaywriter	Displaywrite r	excellent for small SELPA
Sam Comp Evaluator, MIS Kings Co. Schools (209) 584-1441 ADA 1438	IBM 5120	Brads II	works fine
Robert Casey Coordinator, Spec. Ed. San Diego Unified (619) 293-8246 ADA11000	Apple IIe	dB Master	getting updated version for faster search
Ann Sprague San Joaquin SELPA (209) 466-5471 ADA 2428	Altos, hard disk	Selector	fine
Christina Hertel Director, Spec. Ed. Santa Cruz County Office of Ed. (408) 476-7140 ADA 372	Apple II	written for office	excellent
Claude Smith Data Management Shasta County Schools (916) 244-4600 ADA 2200	Altos	written in office	COBOL written in office, works fine
Harriet Word Attendance Clerk Siskiyou County Schools (916) 842-5751 ADA 560	IMS Int'l, Altos	TIM	
Robert White Administrator SELPA South Orange County SELPA (714) 859-0331 ADA 2731	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	

Gary Seaton Sutter County Schools (916) 673-6110 ADA 1040	Lisa, Apple IIe, III	Versaform	will discontinue, more appropriate for business than special
Tom Neely Director, Spec. Schools Tehama County Schools (916) 527-5811 ADA 850	Commodore 8032	Wordpro	plan to drop this software at end of year
Donald Stewart Director Spec. Ed. Trinity County Schools (916) 623-2861 ADA 250	Apple II	Visifile	good

Application: IEP Maintenance

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
County Office			
Ardis Loonie Director, Spec. Services San Benito County Office of Ed. (408) 637-5393 ADA 243	Apple II	dB Master	great
District Offices			
Barbara Hamilton Director of Ed. Services Adelanto Elemantary SD (619) 246-8691	Apple IIe	Unistar	works fine
Barbara Hahn Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Alvord Unified SD (714) 351-9367	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	works fine
John Sugiyama Director of Sp. Services Amador Valley/Pleasanton SD (415) 464-5500	TRS-80	Profile III+	works well
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	dBase II	adequate for use so far
Richard Simpson Director of Spec. Ed. Conejo Valley Unified (805) 497-9511	Apple IIe, hard disk	dB Master	easy to use
Vera Jashni Asst. Supt. Ed. Services Culver City Unified (213) 839-4361	Apple II+	PFS File & Report	Excellent, but limited in number of files can store

Joseph D Director of Sp. Ed. Gridley Union Elementary (916) 846-4721	Commodore	File Cabinet	works fine
Brian Dixon Superintendent Hope Elementary (805) 682-2564	Apple II+	PFS File & Report	running out of memory, but works well
Jack Taylor Director, Spec. Ed. Murray Elementary (415) 828-2554	TRS-80	Profile III+	easy to learn, works well
Dennis Kelleher Director, Pupil Personnel Novato Unified (415) 897-4201	Apple III	PFS File & Report	new, confusing, are still learning
Chris Prator Psychologist Orland Joint Union Elementary (916) 865-3283	TRS-80 Model 3	Profile III	more capabilities than they really need, complex to learn
Betty Dodds Director, Instruction Oxnard Union High (805) 486-4777	CPT Word Processor	CPT	
Joe Annicharico, Jr Asst. Supt. Ramona Unified SD (619) 789-2124	Apple II+	dB Master	works well
Jere Ancell Asst. Supt., Ed. Ser. Santee Elementary (619) 448-2510	Apple IIe	ADD (Abil. Ach. Dis)	saves time in checking
Susan Rookyard Coordinator, Spec. Ed. South Bay Union Elem. (619) 423-4555	Micom Word Processor	Micom	fine

Tris Hubbard Asst. Supt.,Inst. Support Sweetwater Union High (619) 691-5590	TRS-80 Model 3	written in office	works well
Carole Stone Psychologist Yorba Linda Elementary (714) 528-6088	Apple IIe	written in office	works well
SELPAs			
Peter Gonos Director Contra Costa SELPA (415) 827-0949 ADA 6000	Altos	Ed. Res. Consultants	just implementing
Sam Comp Evaluator, MIS Kings Co. Schools (209) 584-1441 ADA 1438	IBM 5120	Brads II	works fine
Robert Casey Coordinator, Spec. Ed. San Diego Unified (619) 293-8246 ADA11000	Apple IIe	dB Master	are sending for updated version for faster search
Harriet Word Attendance Clerk Siskiyou County Schools (916) 842-5751 ADA 560	IMS Int'l, Altos	TIM	
Robert White Administrator SELPA South Orange County SELPA (714) 859-0331 ADA 2731	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	
Tom Neely Director, Spec. Schools Tehama County Schools (916) 527-5811 ADA 850	Commodore 8032	Manager	good for keeping annual review date

Donald Stewart Director Spec. Ed. Trinity County Schools (916) 623-2861 ADA 250	Apple II	Visifile	good

Application: Student Profiles

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
District Offices			
Barbara Hamilton Director of Ed. Services Adelanto Elemantary SD (619) 246-8691	Apple IIe	Wordhandler II	works fine
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	dBase II	adequate for use so far
Richard Simpson Director of Spec. Ed. Conejo Valley Unified (805) 497-9511	Apple IIe, hard disk	dB Master	easy to use
Kathryn Aschenbrenner Coordinator of Spec. Ed. Modesto City High (209) 576-4011	Apple IIe	Applewriter	fine
Melody Huelsebusch Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Oceanside City Unified (619) 757-2560	Apple II+	dB Master	excellent report generator, takes less programming skills than dBase II
SELPAs			
Peter Gonos Director Contra Costa SELPA (415) 827-0949 ADA 6000	Altos	Ed. Res. Consultants	just implementing

Application: Inventory Control

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
District Offices			
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	PFS File & Report	flexible, can't sort across disks or load to hard disk
Lynn Preston Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Cupertino Union Elementary (408) 252-3000	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	works very well
Kathryn Aschenbrenner Coordinator of Spec. Ed. Modesto City High (209) 576-4011	Apple IIe	Quickfile	fine

Application: Transportation Scheduling

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
District Office			
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	dBase II	have eliminated Visifile, PFS & dBase II much better
SELPAs			
Sam Comp Evaluator, MIS Kings Co. Schools (209) 584-1441 ADA 1438	IBM 5120	Brads II	works fine
Robert White Administrator SELPA South Orange County SELPA (714) 859-0331 ADA 2731	Monroe	Condor	good, a little hard to set up

Application: Discrepancy Score Analysis

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
County Office			
Ardis Loonie Director, Spec. Services San Benito County Office of Ed. (408) 637-5393 ADA 243	Apple II	Selectprint	just beginning
District Offices			
Barbara Hamilton Director of Ed. Services Adelanto Elemantary SD (619) 246-8691	Apple IIe	Unistar	works fine
Deanna Thrift Assistant Superintendent Cabrillo Unified (415) 726-5551	Apple IIe	Woodcock Johnson	
Richard Simpson Director of Spec. Ed. Conejo Valley Unified (805) 497-9511	Apple IIe, hard disk	WISC R	
Bruce Stimmerock Program Specialist Covina-Valley Unified (213) 331-3371	TRS-80	written in office	worked well before laws changed
Jeanette Graham Assistant Supt. for Ins. Lowell Joint Elementary (213) 943-0211	Apple IIe	written in office	works well
Thomas Grave Director, Sp. Services Merced City Elementary (209) 385-6600	Apple	WISC R	not as good as had hoped

Elvin Sigerson Coordinator of Pup. Ser. Perris Elementary (714) 657-2124	Apple IIe	written in office	excellent, prioritizes students by results from screening battery
Shirley Rogers Director, Pup. Per. Ser. Redondo Beach City Elementary (213) 379-5449	Apple IIe	AAD (Abil. Ach. Dis)	good print-outs, quick, eliminates math errors
George Potts Psychologist Roseville City Elementary (916) 786-5090	Apple II+, IIe	Woodcock Johnson	works well
Robert S. Laney Supervisor, Spec. Ed. Vista Unified (619) 726-2170	ATC	ETS/dbase II	less powerful than software on mainframe
SELPAs			
Fay Grassi Los Angeles Unified SD (213) 625-6708	Apple IIe	AAD (Abil. Ach. Dis)	are just implementing
Pat Mannon Mt. Diablo Unified SD (415) 825-0144	Franklin 1000	Woodcock Johnson	
Mary DiSessa Director-Spec. Ed. Riverside Unified SD (714) 788-7142 ADA 2150	Apple IIe	written in office	works fine
Tom Neely Director, Spec. Schools Tehama County Schools (916) 527-5811 ADA 850	Commodore 8032	Woodcock Johnson	

Application: Personnel Schedules

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
District Offices			
John Sugiyama Director of Sp. Services Amador Valley/Pleasanton SD (415) 464-5500	TRS-80	Profile III+	works well
Richard Simpson Director of Spec. Ed. Conejo Valley Unified (805) 497-9511	Apple IIe, hard disk	dB Master	easy to use
Brian Dixon Superintendent Hope Elementary (805) 682-2564	Apple II+	PFS File & Report	works fine, but running out of memory
Melody Huelsebusch Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Oceanside City Unified (619) 757-2560	Apple II+	dB Master	excellent report generator, takes less programming skill than dBase II
Dave Emal Diagnostic Lab Teacher Pomona Unified (714) 623-5251	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	easy to follow, good documentation
Robert S. Laney Supervisor, Spec. Ed. Vista Unified (619) 726-2170	ATC	ETS/dbase II	less powerful than software on mainframe

SELPAs

Peter Gonos Director Contra Costa SELPA (415) 827-0949 ADA 6000	Altos	Ed. Res. Consultants	just implementing
Claude Smith Data Management Shasta County Schools (916) 244-4600 ADA 2200	Altos	written in office	written in COBOL, works fine
Harriet Word Attendance Clerk Siskiyou County Schools (916) 842-5751 ADA 560	IMS Int'l, Altos	TIM	good--can get breakdown on time spent on task
Robert White Administrator SELPA South Orange County SELPA (714) 859-0331 ADA 2731	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	

Application: Entitlement Reports

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
District Offices			
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	Visicalc	
Brian Dixon Superintendent Hope Elementary (805) 682-2564	Apple II+	Visicalc	fantastic
SELPAs			
Eugene Fahlbusch Adminstrator SELPA Desert/Mountain SELPA (619) 243-1240 ADA 2450	IBM Displaywriter	Logicalcalc, Question	somewhat limited
Robert White Administrator SELPA South Orange County SELPA (714) 859-0331 ADA 2731	Apple IIe	Multiplan	excellent
Gary Seaton Sutter County Schools (916) 673-6110 ADA 1040	Lisa, Apple IIe, III	Visicalc	looking around for more versatile program, maybe Lotus 1,2,3

Application: Fiscal Planning/Projections

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
District Offices			
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	Visicalc	
Richard Simpson Director of Spec. Ed. Conejo Valley Unified (805) 497-9511	Apple IIe, hard disk	dB Master	easy to use
Brian Dixon Superintendent Hope Elementary (805) 682-2564	Apple II+	Visicalc	fantastic
Kathryn Aschenbrenner Coordinator of Spec. Ed. Modesto City High (209) 576-4011	Apple IIe	Multiplan	much easier to learn than Visicalc
Melody Huelsebusch Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Oceanside City Unified (619) 757-2560	Apple II+	Visicalc	will change to Lotus 1,2,3 to gain more flexibility
George Potts Psychologist Roseville City Elementary (916) 786-5090	Apple II+, IIe	Visicalc	very good
Illane Klein Director of Sp. Ed. Savanna School District (714) 527-5181	Apple IIe	Visicalc	terrific

SELPAs

Eugene Fahlbusch Adminstrator SELPA Desert/Mountain SELPA (619) 243-1240 ADA 2450	IBM Displaywriter	Logicalcalc, Question	are putting on J 50s, using Pascal with Displaywriter
Harriet Word Attendance Clerk Siskiyou County Schools (916) 842-5751 ADA 560	IMS Int'l, Altos	Micro Plan	good manual, was just installed
Gary Seaton Sutter County Schools (916) 673-6110 ADA 1040	Lisa, Apple IIe, III	Visicalc	looking around for more versatile program--maybe Multiplan or Lotus 1,2,3

Application: Inservice Management

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
SELPAs			
Peter Gonos Director Contra Costa SELPA (415) 827-0949 ADA 6000	Altos	Datastar	
Eugene Fahlbusch Adminstrator SELPA Desert/Mountain SELPA (619) 243-1240 ADA 2450	IBM Displaywriter	Logicalcalc, Question	somewhat limited
Harriet Word Attendance Clerk Siskiyou County Schools (916) 842-5751 ADA 560	IMS Int'l, Altos	TIM	a little cumbersome

Application: State and Federal Reports

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
County Office			
Ardis Loonie Director, Spec. Services San Benito County Office of Ed. (408) 637-5393 ADA 243	Apple II	dB Master	great
District Offices			
Barbara Hahn Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Alvord Unified SD (714) 351-9367	Apple IIe	PFS File & Report	works fine
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	dBase II	adequate for use so far
Richard Simpson Director of Spec. Ed. Conejo Valley Unified (805) 497-9511	Apple IIe, hard disk	Applewriter	
Emily Davis Asst. Superintendent Fairfield-Suisun Unified SD (707) 425-8451	Xerox Word Processor	Xerox	
Melody Huelsebusch Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Oceanside City Unified (619) 757-2560	Apple II+	Wordstar	have just changed to Wordstar from Easywriter, seems fine
Dave Emal Diagnostic Lab Teacher Pomona Unified (714) 623-5251	Apple IIe	Applewriter	works fine

Susan Rookyard Coordinator, Spec. Ed. South Bay Union Elem. (619) 423-4555	Micom Word Processor	Micom	fine

SELPAs

Peter Gonos Director Contra Costa SELPA (415) 827-0949 ADA 6000	Altos	Wordstar	get good end product
Eugene Fahlbusch Adminstrator SELPA Desert/Mountain SELPA (619) 243-1240 ADA 2450	IBM Displaywriter	Logicalcalc, Question	somewhat limited
Sam Comp Evaluator, MIS Kings Co. Schools (209) 584-1441 ADA 1438	IBM 5120	Brads II	works fine
Ann Sprague San Joaquin SELPA (209) 466-5471 ADA 2428	Altos, hard disk	Selector	fine
Harriet Word Attendance Clerk Siskiyou County Schools (916) 842-5751 ADA 560	IMS Int'l, Altos	TIM	very useful
Donald Stewart Director Spec. Ed. Trinity County Schools (916) 623-2861 ADA 250	Apple II	Visifile	good

Application: Internal Reports (memos, etc.)

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
District Offices			
Barbara Hamilton Director of Ed. Services Adelanto Elemantary SD (619) 246-8691	Apple IIe	Wordhandler II	works fine
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	PFS File & Report	flexible, can't sort across disks or load to hard disk
Richard Simpson Director of Spec. Ed. Conejo Valley Unified (805) 497-9511	Apple IIe, hard disk	Wordstar	just gearing up
Vera Jashni Asst. Supt. Ed. Services Culver City Unified (213) 839-4361	Apple II+	Wordstar	works well
Emily Davis Asst. Superintendent Fairfield-Suisun Unified SD (707) 425-8451	Xerox Word Processor	Xerox	
Judith Box Director, Sp. Services Franklin-McKinley Elementary (408) 286-5959	IBM PC	PFS File & Report	great
Brian Dixon Superintendent Hope Elementary (805) 682-2564	Apple II+	Applewriter II	just gearing up, fine so far

Jeanette Graham Assistant Supt. for Ins. Lowell Joint Elementary (213) 943-0211	Apple IIe	Bank St. Writer	just learning
Kathryn Aschenbrenner Coordinator of Spec. Ed. Modesto City High (209) 576-4011	Apple IIe	Applewriter	fine
Jack Taylor Director, Spec. Ed. Murray Elementary (415) 828-2554	TRS-80	Superscript Set	works well, good training tape
Melody Huelsebusch Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Oceanside City Unified (619) 757-2560	Apple II+	Wordstar	have just changed to Wordstar from Easywriter, seems fine
Chris Prator Psychologist Orland Joint Union Elementary (916) 865-3283	TRS-80 Model 3	Superscript Set	almost too powerful, excellent training tapes
Will Hardy Student Data Files San Jose Unified (408) 998-6034	Apple IIe	Write	
Illane Klein Director of Sp. Ed. Savanna School District (714) 527-5181	Apple IIe	Magicwindow	terrific
Jon Frieseke Coordinator of Spec. Ser. Sonoma Valley Unified (707) 938-8545	Apple IIe	Micromemo	not good, awkward, hard to get info out
Susan Rookyard Coordinator, Spec. Ed. South Bay Union Elem. (619) 423-4555	Micom Word Processor	Micom	fine

Robert S. Laney Supervisor, Spec. Ed. Vista Unified (619) 726-2170	ATC	ETS/dBase II	less powerful than software on mainframe

SELPAs

Peter Gonos Director Contra Costa SELPA (415) 827-0949 ADA 6000	Altos	Wordstar	get good end product
Eugene Fahlbusch Adminstrator SELPA Desert/Mountain SELPA (619) 243-1240 ADA 2450	IBM Displaywriter	Logicalcalc, Question	somewhat limited
Bonnie Plummer SELPA Director Solano County Schools (707) 429-6418	Syntrex	Syntrex	Syntrex system is only for word processing

Application: Parent Letters

Contact	Hardware	Software	Evaluation
District Offices			
George Cagle Psychologist Cajon Valley Union Elementary (619) 588-3053	Apple II+, hard disk	Wordstar	good
Richard Simpson Director of Spec. Ed. Conejo Valley Unified (805) 497-9511	Apple IIe, hard disk	Applewriter	
Lynn Preston Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Cupertino Union Elementary (408) 252-3000	Apple IIe	Applewriter	
Emily Davis Asst. Superintendent Fairfield-Suisun Unified SD (707) 425-8451	Xerox Word Processor	Xerox	
Brian Dixon Superintendent Hope Elementary (805) 682-2564	Apple II+	Applewriter II	just gearing up, fine so far
Jeanette Graham Assistant Supt. for Ins. Lowell Joint Elementary (213) 943-0211	Apple IIe	Wordstar	just learning
Jack Taylor Director, Spec. Ed. Murray Elementary (415) 828-2554	TRS-80	Superscript Set	works well, good training tape

Melody Huelsebusch Coordinator, Sp. Ed. Oceanside City Unified (619) 757-2560	Apple II+	Wordstar	have just changed to Wordstar from Easywriter, seems fine
Chris Prator Psychologist Orland Joint Union Elementary (916) 865-3283	TRS-80 Model 3	Superscript Set	Very powerful, excellent training tapes
Betty Dodds Director, Instruction Oxnard Union High (805) 486-4777	CPT Word Processor	CPT	
Dave Emal Diagnostic Lab Teacher Pomona Unified (714) 623-5251	Apple IIe	Applewriter	works fine
Will Hardy Student Data Files San Jose Unified (408) 998-6034	Apple IIe	Write	
Illane Klein Director of Sp. Ed. Savanna School District (714) 527-5181	Apple IIe	Magicwindow	terrific
Jon Frieseke Coordinator of Spec. Ser. Sonoma Valley Unified (707) 938-8545	Apple IIe	Applewriter II	hard to use with forms, are still learning to use
Susan Rookyard Coordinator, Spec. Ed. South Bay Union Elem. (619) 423-4555	Micom Word Processor	Micom	fine
John C. Davis Acting Dir. Pupil Pers. Woodland Joint Unified (916) 662-0201	Apple III	Applewriter	testing out, easy to learn

SELPAs

Peter Gonos Director Contra Costa SELPA (415) 827-0949 ADA 6000	Altos	Wordstar	get good end product
Eugene Fahlbusch Adminstrator SELPA Desert/Mountain SELPA (619) 243-1240 ADA 2450	IBM Displaywriter	Displaywriter	get good support from IBM
Ann Sprague San Joaquin SELPA (209) 466-5471 ADA 2428	Altos, hard disk	Wordstar	
Christina Hertel Director, Spec. Ed. Santa Cruz County Office of Ed. (408) 476-7140 ADA 372	Apple II	Applewriter	just gearing up
Robert White Administrator SELPA South Orange County SELPA (714) 859-0331 ADA 2731	Apple IIe	Applewriter	

Appendices

Appendix A.....Project Abstract

Appendix B.....Questionnaire and Cover Letter

Appendix C.....Tables 1 through Tables 5

Appendix D.....Tables 6 through Tables 10

Appendix E.....Copy of the Structured Interview Guide

Appendix A

ABSTRACT

Leadership Training for Administrators of Special Education in Emerging Technology

1. Objective and Need for this Assistance

Evolving technology and increasing budget pressures are encouraging special education administrators to turn toward computers as a way of streamlining program administration requirements. Unfortunately few special administrators are prepared to use the evolving technology. School district budgets rarely include adequate funds for training, and few courses, if any, are currently designed specifically for special education administrators and the use of computer technology. As a result, administrators are forced to seek out training from other sources, adapt procedures to special education on their own, and make costly investments of time and energy without knowing the availability of existing solutions. This project will build on existing legislative and State Education Agency (SDE) support by coordinating the resources of the Teacher Education Computer Centers (TECCs), institutions of higher education (IHEs), and the Special Education Resource Network (SERN) to address the identified need of special education administrators for in-service training and support in the use of microcomputers for special education program administration.

The principle objective of this project is to facilitate the application of emerging computer technology to special education program administration in California by providing special education program administrators with the needed awareness, knowledge, skills, and support to understand and use computer applications.

Subordinate objectives include: (1) to provide administrators of special education programs with a cost effective statewide process for identifying, collecting, analyzing, and disseminating information on the application of computer resources for special education program management; (2) to provide an ongoing regional support system to special education administrators who are using computer applications for program management; (3) to facilitate the development of needed software applications for special education program management, and (4) to provide in-service training to administrators of special education programs for acquiring the awareness, knowledge, and skills to use emerging technology for program administration.

2. Results of Benefits Expected

The major product of the project will be the development of five in-service training modules for providing special education administrators with an awareness of, and knowledge and skills in, the application of computer technology for special education program administration. In-service training on the five modules will be provided to 200 special education administrators. Training will be provided for approximately 50 trainers from TECCs, IHEs, and SERN. The project will develop a Critical Consumer and Users Guide (CCUG) to provide a process for disseminating statewide information on emerging technology and its potential application for special education program administration. Regional groups will be established to provide ongoing information and support to computer users. Unmet

software needs will be identified, and commercial and private software producers will be actively solicited to develop needed software.

3. Approach

The project includes eight major tasks: (1) Needs Assessment; (2) Data Collection on Computer Resources; (3) Critical Consumer and User Guide (CCUG); (4) Five In-service Training Modules; (5) In-service Training and the Training of Trainers; (6) Regional User Support Groups; (7) Development of Needed Software; and (8) Evaluation. Project staff will coordinate all tasks. An advisory committee consisting of computer and special education experts, representatives from the SDE, IHEs, TECCs, and CASE will be formed in Year 1 to develop the needs assessment process, and will be maintained over the three years of the project to review all project-developed products and processes. Consultants with expertise in computers and special education will be hired to develop the five in-service training modules. The SERN network, TECCs, and IHEs will be used to provide ongoing dissemination of project-developed training materials. It is intended that several of the resources developed as part of this project will continue to be maintained beyond the life of the project including: the Regional User Support Group; the updating of the Critical Consumer and Users Guide; and the ongoing collection, analysis, and dissemination of information on emerging computer technology by the Resource Service Center of SERN.

The project evaluation design includes a process, product, and outcome evaluation model. The five training modules and the CCUG will be evaluated in terms of the increase in administrator's awareness, knowledge, and skills in applying computer technology to special education program administration. The in-service training will be evaluated in terms of the degree to which it meets identified objectives, and participants perceptions of the process. Data will be collected on the Regional User Support Groups and the development of needed software. Project outcomes will be evaluated in Years 2 and 3 in terms of the increase in the number of special education administrators utilizing computer technology for special education program administration.

Appendix B

Resource Service Center
Foundation, CSUS and
School of Education, Dept. of Special Services, CSUS
SEAN Complex, 650 University Ave., Room 201
Sacramento, Calif. 95825
(916) 921-0521

SPECIAL EDUCATION RESOURCE NETWORK

December 12, 1983

Dear Special Education Program Administrator,

Enclosed in this packet is a short questionnaire requesting information on how you currently process information related to special education program administration. As computer technology becomes a part of our public education system in California we find that more and more administrators are exploring the use of computers for facilitating program management. From the information we collect from program administrators like yourself, we will be able to identify the needs of administrators for technical assistance in the use of computers for program management as well as identify resources in the form of "experts" (adminstrators who are already using computers for special education program administration).

This data collection effort is being conducted by the Resource Service Center of the Special Education Resource Network. We have been awarded a three year federally funded project to facilitate the use of computer technology for special education program administration throughout California. Over the next two and a half years project resources will provide training and technical assistance to administrators so that they can become critical users and consumers of computer technology. The enclosed questionnaire is part of the first major task of the project which is to identify the levels at which administrators are currently using computers for special education program administration.

Therefore, we are asking that you take a few minutes and complete the short questionnaire and return it to us as soon as possible. We will be doing follow up telephone calls to some administrators who indicate that they would be willing to provide additional information. All administrators who return the questionnaire will receive a copy of the data report about the end of February 1984. The report will contain information about how other agencies in your area are currently using computers as well as the experts who are willing to share their knowledge and expertise with you. You will also be put on a contact list to receive information on training and technical assistance as it becomes available.

We have included a copy of our project abstract for your information. If you have any questions please feel free to call me.

Janet D. Jamieson

Janet D. Jamieson
Project Coordinator

JDJ:akw

ADMINISTRATIVE USES OF MICROCOMPUTERS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

A Survey Conducted By
The Resource Service Center
SERN

This survey has two major purposes. First, to gather information about the current use of microcomputers in special education administration. This information will be used to guide the development of training in specific administrative applications of microcomputers of interest to those concerned with planning and administering special education programs.

The second purpose is to develop a resource bank of administrators who are currently using microcomputers and who may be interested in forming regional user-support groups to foster the use of microcomputers for administrative purposes.

Below is a duplicate of the address label used to mail this survey to you. If any of the information is obsolete, please correct it so we may send you the survey results.

This survey is organized by the following administrative functions.

A. Pupil Records - IEP maintenance, student profiles, discrepancy score analysis

B. Staffing - Personnel schedules, class/service lists, inservice management

C. Fiscal - Planning/projections, budget maintenance, entitlement reports

D. Reports - Internal (memos, etc.), state and federal

E. Miscellaneous - parent letters, inventory control, transportation scheduling

We have included a brief description for some of these functions.

FOR EACH APPLICATION WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO INDICATE WITH A CHECK (✓):
(YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE IF APPLICABLE)

1. How it is currently done - by hand or by computer and if by computer do you use a microcomputer or a mainframe.

2. Where it is done - in your (special education office, somewhere else in the district office or the county office).

A. Pupil Records

(See below for description of terms)	How Currently Done?			Where Currently Done?		
	By Hand	By Computer Micro	By Computer Mainframe	Your Office	District Office	County Office
IEP Maintenance[1]						
Student Profiles[2]						
Discrepancy Score[3] Analysis						
Other _____						

1. Storage and retrieval of information such as student name, test scores, placement, handicapping conditions.

2. Generation of reports by student showing information such as test scores over time, progress towards goals.

3. Perform statistical computations necessary to generate discrepancy scores for determining elegibility.

B. Staffing

(See below for description of terms)	How Currently Done?			Where Currently Done?		
	By Hand	By Computer Micro	By Computer Mainframe	Your Office	District Office	County Office
Personnel Schedules[1.]						
Class/Service Lists[2.]						
Inservice Management[3.]						
Other _____						

1. Generate listings of staff by criteria such as assignment, location, credential.
2. Generate and maintain lists of students served in classes, RSP, speech and language, other services.
3. Records of inservice needs, inservice delivered, inservice received.

C. Fiscal

	How Currently Done?			Where Currently Done?		
	By Hand	By Computer Micro	By Computer Mainframe	Your Office	District Office	County Office
Planning/Projections						
Budget Maintenance						
Entitlement Reports						
Other _____						

D. Reports

	How Currently Done?			Where Currently Done?		
	By Hand	By Computer Micro	By Computer Mainframe	Your Office	District Office	County Office
Internal (memos, etc.)						
State and Federal						
Other _____						

	How Currently Done?		Where Currently Done?		
	By Hand	By Computer Micro Mainframe	Your Office	District Office	County Office
Parent Letters					
Inventory Control					
Transportation Scheduling					
Other _____					

We would like to gather some more detailed information by following up a small number of returned surveys with telephone calls.

Please check here ( ) if we may call you.

RESOURCES

We would like you to give us the name and telephone number of anyone (including yourself) you would recommend as a resource to others in the application of microcomputers to special education administration.

Name: _____ Tel: _____

Name: _____ Tel: _____

Name: _____ Tel: _____

We would appreciate receiving your response no later than January 7, 1984. Please return it to Janet D. Jamieson, Project Coordinator, Resource Service Center, SERN Complex, 650 University Ave., Sacramento, CA 95825 in the enclosed envelope.

Janet D. Jamieson
Project Coordinator

Martin L. Harris
Project Consultant

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Appendix C

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF CURRENTLY USED METHODS CHART 1

Districts < 5000 ADA		By Hand	Micro	Mainframe	Row Total
	number	62	16	14	92
IEP	% row	67	17	15	
Maintenance	% table	5	1	1	7
		77	2	3	82
Student		93	2	3	
Profiles		6	0	0	6
Discrepancy		72	10	0	82
Score		87	12	0	
Analysis		5	0	0	6
		70	5	10	85
Personnel		82	5	11	
Schedules		5	0	0	6
		51	21	26	98
Class/Service		52	21	26	
Lists		4	1	2	8
		78	2	1	81
Inservice		96	2	1	
Management		6	0	0	6
		65	6	14	85
Planning/		76	7	16	
Projection		5	0	1	6
		38	13	37	88
Budget		43	14	42	
Maintenance		3	1	3	7
		59	6	26	91
Entitlement		64	6	28	
Reports		4	0	2	7
		75	12	4	91
Internal		82	13	4	
(memos, etc.)		0	0	0	0
		84	14	1	99
State and		97	14	1	
Federal		5	1	1	7
		78	10	2	90
Parent		80	11	2	
Letters		6	0	0	7
		85	6	8	99
Inventory		82	7	9	
Control		5	0	0	6
		62	3	11	76
Transportation		81	3	14	
Scheduling		5	0	0	6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF CURRENTLY USED METHODS CHART 2

5000 < Districts < 10000		By Hand	Micro	Mainframe	Row Total
	number	34	11	15	60
IEP	% row	56	18	25	
Maintenance	% table	4	1	1	7
		47	4	3	54
Student		87	7	5	
Profiles		6	0	0	7
Discrepancy		45	5	2	52
Score		86	9	3	
Analysis		5	0	0	6
		38	8	8	54
Personnel		70	14	14	
Schedules		4	1	1	7
		25	15	19	59
Class/Service		42	25	32	
Lists		3	1	2	7
		48	1	1	50
Inservice		96	2	2	
Management		6	0	0	6
		40	1	11	52
Planning/		76	1	21	
Projection		5	0	1	6
		23	10	30	63
Budget		36	15	47	
Maintenance		3	1	3	8
		28	2	23	53
Entitlement		52	3	43	
Reports		3	0	3	6
		47	9	2	58
Internal		81	15	3	
(memos, etc.)		6	1	0	
		33	4	15	52
State and		63	7	28	
Federal		4	0	1	6
		44	7	4	55
Parent		80	12	7	
Letters		5	0	0	7
		33	4	11	48
Inventory		68	8	22	
Control		4	0	1	6
		39	5	7	51
Transportation		76	10	13	
Scheduling		5	1	2	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF CURRENTLY USED METHODS CHART 3

Districts > 10000 ADA		By Hand	Micro	Mainframe	Row Total
	number	42	15	24	81
IEP	% row	51	18	29	
Maintenance	% table	3	1	2	7
		56	6	9	71
Student		78	8	12	
Profiles		5	0	0	6
Discrepancy		53	14	2	69
Score		76	20	2	
Analysis		4	1	0	6
		34	13	29	76
Personnel		44	17	38	
Schedules		3	1	2	7
		22	23	38	83
Class/Service		26	27	45	
Lists		2	2	3	7
		61	2	0	63
Inservice		96	3	0	
Management		5	0	0	5
		50	11	18	79
Planning/		63	13	22	
Projection		4	1	1	7
		29	14	43	86
Budget		33	16	50	
Maintenance		2	1	4	8
		39	11	21	71
Entitlement		54	15	29	
Reports		3	1	1	6
		62	10	5	77
Internal		80	12	6	
(memos, etc.)		5	0	0	7
		47	14	26	87
State and		54	16	29	
Federal		4	1	2	6
		59	15	6	80
Parent		73	18	7	
Letters		5	1	0	7
		42	9	17	68
Inventory		61	13	25	
Control		3	0	1	6
		48	12	13	73
Transportation		55	16	17	
Scheduling		4	1	1	6

Summary of Currently Used Methods Chart 4

All SELPAs		By Hand	Micro	Mainframe	Row Total
	number	37	16	26	79
IEP	% row	46	20	32	
Maintenance	% table	3	1	2	7
		55	9	10	74
Student		74	12	13	
Profiles		5	0	0	7
Discrepancy		52	13	2	67
Score		77	19	2	
Analysis		3	1	0	6
		37	17	20	74
Personnel		50	22	27	
Schedules		3	1	1	7
		18	27	29	74
Class/Service		24	36	39	
Lists		1	2	2	7
		60	7	0	67
Inservice		89	10	0	
Management		5	0	0	6
		51	14	13	78
Planning/		65	17	16	
Projection		4	1	1	7
		22	15	42	79
Budget		27	18	53	
Maintenance		2	1	4	7
		38	13	15	66
Entitlement		57	19	22	
Reports		3	1	1	6
		56	15	4	75
Internal		74	20	5	
(memos, etc.)		5	1	0	7
		43	17	23	83
State and		51	20	27	
Federal		4	1	2	8
		57	14	9	80
Parent		71	17	11	
Letters		5	1	0	7
		39	7	21	67
Inventory		58	10	31	
Control		3	0	2	6
		42	12	19	73
Transportation		57	16	26	
Scheduling		1	1	1	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary of Currently Used Methods CHART 5

All Countries		By Hand	Micro	Mainframe	Row Total
	number	20	12	11	43
IEP	% row	46	27	25	
Maintenance	% table	3	2	1	7
		32	6	3	41
Student		78	14	7	
Profiles		5	1	0	7
Discrepancy		28	9	1	38
Score		73	23	2	
Analysis		4	1	0	6
		21	11	8	40
Personnel		52	27	20	
Schedules		3	1	1	7
		12	18	11	41
Class/Service		29	43	26	
Lists		2	3	1	7
		32	6	0	38
Inservice		84	15	0	
Management		5	1	0	6
		25	10	6	41
Planning/		60	24	14	
Projection		4	1	1	7
		10	**10**	21	41
Budget		24	24	51	
Maintenance		1	1	3	7
		18	9	9	36
Entitlement		50	25	25	
Reports		3	1	1	6
		29	11	0	40
Internal		72	27	0	
(memos, etc.)		5	1	0	7
		22	12	8	42
State and		52	28	19	
Federal		3	2	1	7
		31	8	5	44
Parent		70	18	11	
Letters		5	1	0	7
		22	6	9	37
Inventory		59	16	24	
Control		3	1	1	6
		25	6	8	39
Transportation		64	15	20	
Scheduling		4	1	1	6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D

SUMMARY OF CURRENTLY USED METHODS CHART 6

Districts < 5000 ADA using micros for task		Your Office	District Office	County Office	Row Total
IEP Maintenance	number	8	6	8	22
	% row	36	27	36	
	% table	4	3	4	12
Student Profiles		2	0	0	2
		100	0	0	
		1	0	0	1
Discrepancy Score Analysis		6	5	1	12
		50	41	8	
		3	2	0	7
Personnel Schedules		2	3	3	8
		25	37	37	
		1	1	1	4
Class/Service Lists		12	7	10	29
		41	24	34	
		7	4	5	16
Inservice Management		1	1	1	3
		33	33	33	
		0	0	0	1
Planning/ Projection		1	4	2	7
		14	57	28	
		0	2	1	4
Budget Maintenance		4	8	2	14
		28	57	14	
		2	4	1	8
Entitlement Reports		0	3	5	8
		0	37	62	
		0	1	2	4
Internal (memos, etc.)		2	3	3	14
		57	21	21	
		4	1	1	8
State and Federal		6	7	12	25
		24	28	48	
		3	4	7	14
Parent Letters		10	3	1	14
		71	21	7	
		5	1	0	8
Inventory Control		4	4	0	8
		50	50	0	
		2	2	0	4
Transportation Scheduling		2	1	2	5
		40	20	40	
		1	0	1	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF CURRENTLY USED METHODS CHART 7

5000 Districts - 10000 using micros for task		Your Office	District Office	County Office	Row Total
	number	5	4	2	11
IEP	% row	45	36	18	
Maintenance	% table	5	4	2	11
		2	1	0	3
Student		66	33	0	
Profiles		2	1	0	3
Discrepancy		2	1	0	3
Score		66	33	0	
Analysis		2	1	0	3
		2	6	1	9
Personnel		22	66	11	
Schedules		2	6	1	9
		11	5	0	16
Class/Service		68	31	0	
Lists		11	5	0	17
		1	1	0	2
Inservice		50	50	0	
Management		1	1	0	2
		0	1	0	1
Planning/		0	100	0	
Projection		0	1	0	1
		4	7	3	14
Budget		28	50	21	
Maintenance		4	7	3	14
		1	0	1	2
Entitlement		50	0	50	
Reports		1	0	1	2
		7	3	0	10
Internal		70	30	0	
(memos, etc.)		7	3	0	10
		2	3	0	5
State and		40	60	0	
Federal		2	3	0	5
		6	2	0	8
Parent		75	25	0	
Letters		6	2	0	8
		3	1	0	4
Inventory		75	25	0	
Control		3	1	0	4
		1	3	2	6
Transportation		1	50	17	
Scheduling		1	3	2	6

SUMMARY OF CURRENTLY USED METHODS CHART 8

Districts : 10000 ADA using micros for task		Your Office	District Office	County Office	Row Total
	number	14	7	0	21
IEP	% row	66	33	0	
Maintenance	% table	6	3	0	9
		4	4	0	8
Student		50	50	0	
Profiles		1	1	0	3
Discrepancy		6	5	0	11
Score		54	45	0	
Analysis		2	2	0	4
		11	8	1	20
Personnel		55	40	5	
Schedules		4	3	0	8
		17	9	6	32
Class/Service		53	28	18	
Lists		7	4	2	14
		1	2	0	3
Inservice		33	66	0	
Management		0	0	0	1
		7	8	1	16
Planning/		43	50	6	
Projection		3	3	0	7
		8	12	0	20
Budget		40	60	0	
Maintenance		3	5	0	8
		7	6	2	15
Entitlement		46	40	13	
Reports		3	2	0	5
		8	4	1	13
Internal		61	30	7	
(memos, etc.)		3	1	0	5
		11	9	3	23
State and		47	39	13	
Federal		4	4	1	10
		12	7	0	19
Parent		63	36	0	
Letters		5	3	0	8
		3	6	0	9
Inventory		33	66	0	
Control		1	2	0	4
		3	11	0	14
Transportation		21	79	0	
Scheduling		1	4	0	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF CURRENTLY USED METHODS CHART 9

All SELPAs using micros for task		Your Office	District Office	County Office	Row Total
IEP Maintenance	number	10	7	6	23
	% row	43	30	26	
	% table	3	2	2	9
Student Profiles		3	6	2	11
		27	54	18	
		1	2	0	4
Discrepancy Score Analysis		3	8	1	12
		25	66	8	
		1	3	0	4
Personnel Schedules		8	10	4	22
		36	45	18	
		3	3	1	8
Class/Service Lists		12	10	9	31
		38	32	29	
		4	3	3	12
Inservice Management		4	3	1	8
		50	37	12	
		1	1	0	3
Planning/ Projection		6	7	6	19
		31	36	31	
		2	2	2	7
Budget Maintenance		8	9	6	23
		34	39	26	
		3	3	2	9
Entitlement Reports		7	3	4	14
		50	21	28	
		2	1	1	5
Internal (memos, etc.)		11	3	6	20
		55	15	30	
		4	1	2	7
State and Federal		13	4	5	22
		59	18	22	
		5	1	1	8
Parent Letters		11	6	5	22
		50	27	22	
		4	2	1	8
Inventory Control		3	5	3	11
		27	45	27	
		1	1	1	4
Transportation Scheduling		3	8	2	13
		23	61	15	
		1	3	1	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF CURRENTLY USED METHODS CHART 10

All Counties using micros for task		Your Office	District Office	County Office	Row Total
	number	6	4	6	16
IEP	% row	37	25	37	
Maintenance	% table	3	2	3	9
		1	4	2	7
Student		14	57	28	
Profiles		0	2	1	4
Discrepancy		4	7	2	13
Score		30	53	15	
Analysis		2	4	1	7
		4	5	4	13
Personnel		30	38	30	
Schedules		2	2	2	7
		7	5	7	19
Class/Service		36	26	36	
Lists		4	2	4	11
		4	2	1	7
Inservice		57	28	14	
Management		2	1	0	4
		4	3	6	13
Planning/		30	23	46	
Projection		2	1	3	7
		6	4	6	16
Budget		37	25	37	
Maintenance		3	2	3	9
		4	0	4	8
Entitlement		50	0	50	
Reports		2	0	2	4
		8	1	6	15
Internal		53	6	40	
(memos, etc.)		4	0	3	8
		8	0	5	13
State and		61	0	38	
Federal		4	0	2	7
		8	2	4	12
Parent		50	16	33	
Letters		3	1	2	7
		3	3	4	10
Inventory		30	30	40	
Control		1	1	2	5
			2	2	6
			33	33	
			1	1	3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix E

Date: _____

Caller's Name: _____

MICRO ADMIN FOLLOW UP TELEPHONE SURVEY

Place respondent label here:

Introduction: (refer to survey, project, etc.)

HARDWARE

1. How many microcomputers do you currently use for special education program management? _____

2. What brand(s)? (1) _____ (2) _____

   (3) _____ (4) _____

3. Where (is it/are they) located? _____

   _____

SOFTWARE

4. I see from your survey that you are using a microcomputer for _____

   _____

   I would like to know the software you are using for each application

   (code on attached form) and how well it is working for your needs.

5. Are there other applications your are planning to implement or would like to implement but currently do not have the software to do so?

   If yes, please list: _____

   _____

6. Would you be willing to review the software you are using in terms of how you use it (for what applications), limitations, problems, advantages, etc.?

   Yes _____

   No _____

DATA SYSTEM

7. Could you describe how you current data management system works?

in terms of: who does it/paper flow

collecting data _____

_____

imputing data _____

_____

managing data _____

designing reports _____

_____

8. How well does your current system work for you?_____

_____

9. What changes would you make (planning to make)that would improve the system?

_____

_____

TRAINING

10. Have you had any training in using microcomputers? If yes, please describe (who provided it, what kind, etc.) _____

_____

11. Are there areas in which you would like to have training for using your microcomputer for program management? If yes, please describe (content, when, where delivered, etc) _____

_____

12. Has your staff received any training for using micocomputers? If yes, please describe (who provided it, what kind, etc.)_____ _____

_____

13. Does your staff have additional training needs? and if so, please describe:

_____

_____

USER SUPPORT GROUPS

14. Are you currently involved (do you participate) in a user support of some kind? If yes, please describe (what type, how frequently they meet, etc.)

_____

_____

15. Would you be interested in participating in a users support groups in your area for special education program administrators.if one were available?

yes _____

no_____

16. If another special education program administrator in your area were considering implementing the use of microcomputers for program management, or using a type of software you are knowledgeable about, would you be willing to be a resource that we could refer them to? yes _____ no_____

17. Would you be willing to review software you are currently using for program management so that others who are considering purchasing software could have that information accessable? (review in terms of how you use it, for what, limitations, advantages, etc.) yes _____ no_____

18. Is there anyting we didn't cover in the survey or in this conversation that you feel would help us in developing training and user support groups for administrators of speical education programs in California? if so what,

_____

_____

_____

_____

19. Thats all the questions I have, do you have any questions you would like to ask me, and if so what? _____

_____

APPLICATION	SOFTWARE	EVALUATION